DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 660 LI 001 461

By-Wasserman, Paul

Trends and Directions in Library Education and Library Practice. Isabel Nichol Lecture Series.

Denver Univ., Colo. Graduate School of Librarianship.
Pub Date 21 Feb 68
Note-16p.
Available from-Graduate School of Librarianship, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado 80210 (Free)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-Administration, Doctoral Programs, *Experimental Programs, Faculty, Information Science, *Library Education, Library Research, Library Schools, *Library Science, Students

The author notes three approaches to library education today: the traditional approach, the information science approach, and the approach which seeks to use what is best in the traditional while incorporating the more promising innovations. The author feels that library education ought to prepare librarians to be solution seekers rather than unquestioning technicians. Faculty in library education should be specifically prepared for roles in education, research, and scholarship. Library education must draw on related disciplines and provide laboratory experiences for students. More research, other than historical and bibliographical studies and applied surveys, must be done, particularly at the doctoral level. The author feels that the most crucial problem in librarianship today may be commitment to the profession. Examples of experimental programs underway at the University of Maryland School of Library and Information Services are discussed. (CC)

TRENDS AND DIRECTIONS IN LIBRARY EDUCATION AND LIBRARY PRACTICE

BY PAUL WASSERMAN

ISABEL NICHOL LECTURE SERIES

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF LIBRARIANSHIP

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF LIBRARIANSHIP
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

FEBRUARY 21, 1968

REMARKS ON THE INAUGURATION OF THE ISABEL NICHOL LECTURE SERIES, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF LIBRARIANSHIP, UNIVERSITY OF DENVER, FEBRUARY 21, 1968

BY
PAUL N. FRAME

Those of you who knew Miss Isabel Nichol would know that she would immensely approve a gathering such as this one tonight. She enjoyed lectures, conclaves, meetings of librarians, the exchange of ideas between members of the library profession. She would appreciate a lecture series in her honor.

Miss Nichol's first association with the University of Denver library school was that of student. Dr. Malcolm Wyer, the founder and first dean of the school, described the occasion in this fashion:

"In the early days of the School of Librarianship I received a letter from a librarian friend in California inquiring whether our school would consider an application from a friend who wished to enter library work but who lacked the academic requirements insisted upon by most library schools. The young lady, he said, had been reared in a family of wide cultural interests, with many advantages of travel and stimulating associations, but her education had been in private schools, and she had no college degree. At present she was teaching in a private girl's school. My friend assured me that her personal qualifications, her background, and interest in books fitted her for a successful career as a librarian, and he could recommend her to the University of Denver School of Librarianship.

"I replied that it was the policy of our school to accept a rare student whose personal qualifications seemed to be the equivalent of a college degree. The application was submitted by Isabel Nichol, and since it was clear that she belonged in the above group, she was admitted to the school. She entered as a member of the third class and graduated in 1934.

"She was ambitious and determined to continue her studies. At a great sacrifice of her strength she earned the B.A. degree from the University of Denver, and later the M.A. from the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago.

"She joined the staff of the Denver Public Library and organized the Young People's Collection where she developed a service of high quality."

Dr. Wyer concluded his remarks by noting that after further experience in the public libraries of Portland, Oregon, and Des Moines, Iowa, Miss Nichol returned to Denver in 1941 as a member of the faculty of the Library School.

This was, of course, at the invitation of both Dr. Wyer and Miss Harriet Howe, who was then director.

The Library School at the University of Denver had been established in 1931. It offered a three-quarter graduate program culminating in a B.S. in L.S. degree and was accredited by the American Library Association three years later. In 1947 the school made library education history by establishing the first program leading to a master's degree. In 1961, during the directorship of Dr. Stuart Baillie, the name was changed from School of Librarianship to the more appropriate Graduate School of Librarianship.

A few years before her death in 1964, Miss Nichol wrote out a few notes which she may have intended to expand into a reminiscence of the school, and it is certainly to be regretted that she did not.

In her notes she said: "We have tried to teach the best in literature, art and music and the scholarly sciences. We have tried to make the school a warm and stimulating place where the student can learn that the book arts are the arts of Librarianship."

Miss Nichol was saying, of course, that the school was very much humanistically oriented with accent on knowing the classics in various disciplines, the outstanding reference books, and basic cataloging principles. The school has taught that those who come must go out and do. As befits a master's program, the school has not been highly theoretical in its approach to the discipline of librarianship. The needs of the Mountain-Plains area in which the school is located, has had much to do with determining the nature of the school and in giving it its many strengths and dominant characteristics.

The advent of this lecture series indicates, I'm sure, a widening of horizons, a contrasting of points of views, an exploring of ideas, goals, methods, techniques, philosophies which are more characteristic of other places than here.

Miss Nichol, who loved "travel, change, excitement," would most certainly approve, I'm sure, of this lecture series made possible by generous provisions in her will. It is the intent, I understand from Miss Hatch, that this will be an annual affair. This is a decision in which the alumni heartily concur.

TRENDS AND DIRECTIONS IN LIBRARY EDUCATION AND LIBRARY PRACTICE

BY
PAUL WASSERMAN

Let me preface my remarks by acknowledging my debt to all who are parties at interest to the newly established Isabel Nichol Lecture Series. I am deeply honored to be your first speaker. I am thoroughly enjoying this association with your School during this week in your midst and I have found no reason to lose faith in the well known hospitality of the Denver area, or in the extraordinary beauty of your region. I find it a most attractive part of the world. Your faculty has been congenial, open to ideas and suggestion, and thoroughly cordial. I find your student body very attractive—physically attractive as well as intellectually attractive, and I think this too is a tribute to the mountain states.

I shall talk this evening of general trends, but my illustrations will, for the most part, be drawn from one case study—the experiment in library education we are conducting at Maryland. In many fields, and librarianship is one of them, there have been lead-lag relationships between academia and practice. As an applied pragmatic pursuit, the strides, the advances which have most typically taken place have been in the field. I shall say some things about why practice has advanced beyond scholarship and of the implications, but I am firmly convinced that in the correlation and inter-relationship between education and practice, the contribution of the academic must come nearer to parity with the operational, and ultimately to surpass and so redirect it. This is not to suggest that professional education for librarianship concern itself with knowledge, or the quest for knowledge, for its own sake. Its ends are and must be tied to advancing performance for those who need or seek information.

If there is to be one essential strain in my remarks, it is the central element of change. We are in a very crucial period in librarianship, when maturity of the field,

and perhaps even survival, requires us to innovate, to adapt, to change, and to provide hospitality for change. We are in a time calling for the questioning of our conventions and traditions, of our library culture and of its practices, and for the seeking of solutions to problems in new, bold and imaginative ways. This is a very difficult prospect for any field. For a conservative profession committed to deep seated traditions and values, the burden is heavier. For one student, the negative proclivity of librarianship was summed up in the big sign on the coin operated library photocopier which read, "Sorry, no change."

It is interesting to note how the libraries in our culture which have enjoyed such a long heritage of continuity and support are essentially insignificant for so many. And, how and why in other cultures when social upheaval or revolution is at work, it is the libraries which are seized or stormed and burned. Today, our institutions are besieged and beleaguered. The school and the university are often at storm center. But, what of our libraries? The library will have to change. For if it does not, it will survive only as certain religions survive: in narrow pockets with sanctimonious lip service paid. And, patrons who shunt their young to Sunday School (story hour?), but who seek elsewhere for reverence and for relevance.

Why change? Not the least reason is that we are in a period in which we are competing and being competed with very fiercely for continued responsibility and control of the information function. Traditional library programs, functions and personnel represent only one of the many alternatives. The culture can and does find accommodation to its information requirements elsewhere. Change is the end product of finding new solutions. And, because the quest for knowledge is the function of the university, it is here where the principal thrust may legitimately be sought. For, in practice there is simply not the time or the perspective to sort out the issues, to assess and to weigh alternatives. Practice is where new fires are springing up constantly, where energies are exhausted in simply keeping affairs under control. It is the university and the professional school within it, which has the time, the opportunity and detachment, yes and the responsibility, for asking the essential questions and reorienting the vision of the discipline.

Let me try to characterize what's happening in education for librarianship, very briefly, by suggesting that there are essentially three routes which are being traveled. I shall be alluding here to statements I have made at other times in other places—for after all, one has only a finite number of ideas. One pattern is perpetuation of the conventional preparation of librarians in the historic traditional manner. Such programs see as their mandate the generation of reinforcements. They serve in effect as sort of replacement training centers for the next generation needed on the firing line. They are little concerned with variation or modification in existing arrangements They are there, in essence, to reinforce the status quo.

At the other end of the continuum are to be found programs which seemingly have nothing to do with librarianship. They are not called library schools; indeed, here the word library or librarianship is scarcely mentioned. These are programs in "information science." They find hospitality in other settings. Illustrations would be Georgia Tech. and Ohio State. Programs of this kind are also being spawned in

computer centers under various descriptive terms. While the word "library" is unmentioned, its products are people who are being prepared for careers in information service. We would be mistaken to assume that they will have no influence upon libraries and information service.

Then there are those programs which seek to adapt and advance library education by retaining that which remains intellectually viable from traditional elements and grafting on newer approaches and components needed to make librarianship more consonant with contemporary requirements within the cultural settings in which libraries now function. I prefer to think that this is characteristic of the Maryland program. Three years ago, I felt that perhaps it was best for library education to proceed along several alternative routes so that out of diversity there might ultimately emerge the soundest lessons. Perhaps it is only to rationalize my own perspectives, but I am now firmly convinced that the middle route holds greatest promise. I have changed my mind because here is where there is keenest value commitment, and consequently, concern with ends, not solely with means. Inherently dangerous in preparation for professional service tied inextricably and overwhelmingly to systems and technology is a value-neutral orientation, and a detachment and disengagement from purpose, goal, objective. I think librarianship is the appropriate guardian of the ends—the point of it all. Yet, library education desperately requires revitalization, adaptation and innovation and new perspectives on its concerns reflecting divergent points of view from those restricted to its classical elements.

At issue is whether significant innovation with its implied criticism of current educational practices can come from within the field. Let me tell you about some experimentation in library educational patterns. While the illustrations are drawn from the Maryland program, I think they may be reflective of broader trends in the process of acculturating new entrants into librarianship.

What we do in professionalizing students is a function of curricular developments. Each student pursues a course in administration. This is a course in bureaucracy which looks at libraries as a case in point. The rationale for such study is that librarians will proceed through their careers more rationally and more intelligently whether or not they assume major administrative responsibility, if they can understand what happens and why, in large scale organizations. Illustrations are drawn from librarianship, but the principles, the concepts and the theoretical contributions of a range of behavioral disciplines, including sociology, psychology and administration, are studied.

Classic elements of cataloging and classification (organization of knowledge in current parlance) focuses less on preparing people to do things than upon making them question what is done, with far less attention to rules than to principles, with comparative values and dysfunctions of competitive systems from Dewey to chain indexing and facet analysis, as the illustrations. The underlying assumption is that the workaday rituals will be abundantly expressed at the work place, that it is less the responsibility of the university to prepare journeymen for applied tasks, but rather thoughtful analytic professionals whose orientation will be to seek imaginative solutions rather than to perpetuate stale dogma. To do so also

implies an orientation to systems analysis and to the potential of machine technology which follows as a logical consequence. It has been rather interesting to note the number of students who proceed on into advanced work of an elective nature from among those who come to the required introductory course in data processing with the greatest trepidation, only to find that here is one of the most satisfying and intellectually provocative elements for them in the academic program. Curricular concern with reference and bibliography is reflected in a faith that the essential expertise is problem solving skill, rather than the capacity to identify titles of physical artifacts (books), yet in spite of some experimentation with team teaching and inclusion of non-traditional elements (psychology, cybernetics), no satisfactory course has yet been achieved. The quest must continue. Team teaching may prove no panacea. Yet, it does force several perspectives on the same problem and may ultimately yield more than what could be hoped for from one instructor groping by himself with the problem. If graduate education can succeed no farther than to enforce students of keen intellect to commit to rote-memory titles out of a constantly changing galaxy of entries across the broad continuum of knowledge, then a better alternative must be found, or this curricular element ultimately abandoned.

Librarianship is an applied discipline. As such, it stands to profit from the involvement of its students in laboratory situations. But the danger of using practice work in routine ongoing library situations is the risk of encouraging and reinforcing the status quo and even of fostering the next generation of librarianship to go forth and do likewise. And so, until we can identify genuine laboratory situations, or create some laboratories of our own for such purposes, as we have done in the widely reported High John project, we are reluctant to move our students into such settings.

Perhaps the most essential ingredient in educational experimentation is the student body. In educational programs fundamentally oriented to change and innovation in librarianship, students pose some very fundamental problems. For many who are drawn to librarianship, it is not the passion of a missionary zeal which attracts. While those engaged and committed to furthering the field identify the present as the most exciting time ever for the field, with more opportunity, more elbow room, more prospect for doing things, trying things, and experimentation than ever before, the long legacy of a public image of librarians and libraries in cliche terms lingers on. People are drawn, have been coming and continue to be attracted to librarianship, not because they identify its potential or see its challenge, but because so often the appeal seems to be a comforting and comfortable ambience, static, unchanging, non-threatening. When students of such perspective come, to mold committed agents of change during their professional study is exceedingly difficult, frequently impossible. Some of the recruits to librarianship are women of "uncertain age," restless from being house-bound and from child rearing, now seeking a career role requiring education, literacy, taste and something just a little more intellectually stimulating than domesticity. They seek an alternative, but not so violent an alternative as one which contemporary librarianship is demonstrated to represent. They seek

something different but not that different. They do not want to be shaken and told that they must adapt, innovate and influence change in librarianship. Their lament is that this is not why they have come. All they sought was really certification, accreditation, and a license to practice a genteel undemanding craft. And, they are right. Why pick on them, even though from their number have come some of the most seriously committed and intellectually sound partisans of an improved librarianship of tomorrow, who can be expected to contribute significantly to practice and the idea stream of the field? The answer, or perhaps I should rather say, the only answer, is not to be found among this group. Recruitment must spring from a wider awareness of the promise, the opportunity and the incentives of this field. Slogans will not suffice in a culture where institutional and professional fraudulence in promotion is such a commonplace. Until libraries become genuinely adaptive and creative, and begin to convey such a sense of themselves to those who are making career choices, new entrants will continue to be attracted for the wrong reasons.

A more subtle problem with students is that if they prove to be very good and when they do become committed to influencing change in librarianship, it is necessary to sort out those libraries where they will find hospitality, not hostility. Some library administrators prefer unthinking cogs who will be content to function without question at low level tasks. Such a setting would prove impossibly frustrating for the keen and zealous newly prepared librarian. But, one of the dilemmas of librarianship is that it is precisely here where the change agents are desperately needed.

In all of this, faculty members are obviously very central. As a relatively new discipline in the constellation of professional schools in the universities, library school faculty members have been drawn predominantly from practice. And this has not been without its serious dysfunctional consequences.

"Professional schools, however much nurtured and protected by the university, are sired by a clientele of practitioners. They are elaborations of an apprentice system and are close to the grass roots. Their first faculties are chosen for demonstrated success and reputation in the professional field regardless of the usual trappings of academic qualifications. Despite their popularity with students and practitioners, however, these people are considered by the rest of the university community as poor relations. They are forced to defend themselves against charges that they are operating trade schools. Under pressure to attain recognized status as a profession and to achieve academic respectability, they therefore raise the academic standards for faculty members. Gradually, this encourages them to think that there are other useful approaches to their subject and reduces their subservience to their immediate clientele. Eventually, at least in the case of medicine and engineering, the professional school incorporates into its own structure representatives of related basis disciplines and seeks to make fundamental contributions to knowledge."[1]

Essentially, this is the pattern in library education. Faculties are undergoing a sort of metamorphosis in which they are being reconstituted from groups made

---

[1]James D. Thompson, "Modern Approaches to Theory in Administration," in *Administrative Theory in Education*, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958, p. 38.

up principally of transplants, displaced or misplaced persons from practice who instruct in what they know based upon their own experience, to consist more of those who have specifically prepared for roles in education, research, and in scholarship. Traditionally, and for reasons of low prestige, limited incentives and inferior working arrangements, library education has been a haven for many who were the weakest links in the chain of librarianship, while those with the keenest intellect and the greatest energy were attracted into practice. The balance here must be set right. Because opportunities in librarianship are almost infinitely abundant, practice still competes for the field's most promising. But the scales are finally being weighted differently, beginning with the lure of attractive fellowships, on to opportunities and incentives fully competitive with those available in the field. Still academic talent is in short supply. Library education has an entrenched tradition and reputation of inadequacy and inferiority to overcome. And the hour is late.

Moreover, even among many who are new to the ranks of library education, a philosophical commitment to the highest standards of intellectual performance is nowhere near being even universally conceded, to say nothing of being translated vigorously into teaching and scholarship. And yet, until there is consensus on the goal of striving for the highest level in educational preparation, how can practice ever be influenced to reach for more than it can grasp? Educational philosophy can never be characterized very simply. It will always be variable, as variable as the breadth of mind of those who teach and study. But to succeed in a changing field in a changing time, an educational philosophy must be oriented to, committed to, tomorrow rather than to yesterday. It must identify with the forward thrust in the direction of the field, not its past moorings. It must illuminate the core of professionalism, the facts of professionalism, rather than its slogans and myths. And if it is to be viable, it must address itself to the conceptual issues and use pragmatics only for illustration and example. In its essence, an educational philosophy must raise fundamental questions about why rather than how, and this must be its pervasive element.

In order to influence change, faculties must be drawn not only from librarianship, but other disciplines which bear upon our concerns. And out of interaction within the context of library education, by blending in the insights and the methodological rigor of related fields, the fiber of library education can be strengthened. Maryland now has a psychologist concentrating on communications and networks, a physicist deeply interested in operations research and cybernetics, a computer scientist on an adjunct basis. But librarianship needs also the insights of sociology, political science, economics, linguistics and philosophy, since each of these disciplines bears importantly upon the field's myriad concerns. And so, faculties must be broadened to comprehend every field germane to its needs by employing such strategies as joint appointments with other faculties, research programs which lure such scholars and ultimately by equipping its own doctoral progeny to function with the methodological capacity of those who are trained in one or another of these areas.

One of the mechanisms necessary in order to advance understanding is the laboratory—here is where a scholar tests, measures, observes and analyzes. To enjoy such a prospect, the High John project has put one library school in the public library business. Maryland started a public library in a Negro ghetto on the outskirts of Washington, D.C., because of a strong concern that the public library in the last third of the twentieth century must begin to adapt itself to constituencies which have traditionally been outside the library's concern. To prepare for such a commitment, it was felt that students in the course of their educational acculturation needed to have opportunity to study and to learn of the problems by participating actively in such a venture and by carrying out academic exercises synchronized with such experience so that the whole process could be drawn into clearest perspective. In essence, this is what High John is all about. Of course, it would not have come to pass without the energy and zeal of the young man who directs the laboratory, of the faculty member who directs the academic side of the student experience, and the cooperation and support of the county public library and the Maryland State Division of Library Extension. While High John may have about it an aura of romance, I assure you that there is nothing romantic at all about young women working after dark in a neighborhood which can explode into violence, in a library which has been broken into so consistently since it was begun that nothing of value can be left unlocked. Yet, this library has found a place in a community dramatically unlike any where normal branch libraries flourish, a constituency among those for whom the public library has heretofore seemed irrelevant, and is functioning in ways which seem to offer as much promise for the public library, and for this portion of the culture, as any program yet devised.

We think other experiments must be mounted as well. For we feel that for librarianship to remain a viable influence in our great urban centers, the public library must be reoriented from its traditional concern with its book collection. We are now planning, in conjunction with one of our leading public libraries, the Enoch Pratt Free Library, for the design and testing of an information clearing center to comprehend information sources located anywhere in the community and going well beyond the confines of the library's book collection. And in this program, our faculty, our students, the city and the public library, will all be elements in an experiment which, if we achieve some measure of success, may identify ways of advancing the public library to the next and more sophisticated stages in its evolution as the information center of the city.

The correlate of the laboratory is research. While it would be foolhardy in the extreme in a field of professional practice like librarianship for its scholars to address themselves exclusively to problems which bear no relationship to the contemporary requirements of the field, research in librarianship has centered very little attention upon problems of empirical concern. Two predominant types of research have prevailed. One has focused upon historic and bibliographic issues. A review of the dissertation output of library schools of the last decade would reflect how disproportionately heavy this emphasis has been in relation to the

overall effort. The other has been concentrated upon very short-term applied studies. Such activity is reflected in the plethora of surveys and consultancies carried out by library educators and others. While these efforts may be supportive of the requirements of individual libraries or library systems, and doubtless economically appealing to their purveyors, the sum of such effort appears to be less than efficacious for advancing understanding or improving our insight into principles. Neither the historic/bibliographic study nor the applied survey approaches the fundamental concerns of librarianship, assaults the underlying problems through careful observation, testing, and analysis of alternatives. Now, this is not to suggest that research in librarianship calls for an ivory tower concern with problems for their own sake. While the depth of analysis offers most when it penetrates to the core issues, the goal ultimately and inevitably is improved practice and service.

A field advances most rapidly when its members are rejuvenated and updated periodically, for the promise of professional education is to perform a role as genuine introduction to lifelong study of that profession. Perhaps I may speak of some programs upon which we are, or hope to be engaged, which illustrate how continuing education serves to advance practice and those who perform most effectively. In one of our programs, administrators from some of the large libraries are brought together for a two-week concentrated study experience in which the faculty consists of scholars drawn from administration, behavioral science, and librarianship. The focus of the seminar is not librarianship, but administration. The issues, and the principles, are translated into library terms, either by the instructor, when he knows enough to speak knowledgeably about libraries, or by the library administrators, in discussions where the ideas and issues are translated into library context. Such a program seems to us to be most important because the route to succession into library administrative roles does not normally call for anything other than the traditional technical route. One works in a special phase of librarianship, succeeds in achieving supervisory responsibility in it, and ultimately moves high enough in the administrative hierarchy to the point when she, or more typically he, has broad managerial responsibility in it, and is assuming concern and responsibility for a whole range of activities which his technical preparation and experience have not equipped him to assume. With the growth in size, scale and complexity, libraries are becoming more and more complicated organizationally, with the attendant concerns of planning, politics, finance and personnel management. Yet, our administrative class has had little formal preparation for such responsibilities. The Library Administrators Development Program is essentially an attempt to provide a concentrated dose of such educational indoctrination. A more subtle purpose of the program is to influence the directors or assistant directors of some of our most important libraries to the view that their organizations must provide hospitality to, and encourage innovation. This would imply the fostering of a climate of encouragement for the types of change agents we hope the library schools will be generating and exporting among them.

But, while senior library administrators are a powerful element in the propensity of libraries to be adaptive, they are not the only important

instruments of progress. Every library supervisor, to a degree, is an influence upon the forward thrust of librarianship. And those in supervisory roles, just as the senior administrators, typically assume their roles with little prior orientation to managerial perspectives. They will typically simply assume responsibility and perform as well as they are able. We are therefore now preparing to offer a continuing education program for the middle management level in librarianship, dedicated to meet the needs of those who must provide leadership at this level of supervision.

Perhaps the most essential element in advancing librarianship and assuring its maturity is the capacity of the field to identify and prepare effectively those who will educate our successors. Library scholarship has traditionally not prepared appropriately the scholars, the researchers, the educators, which it requires. Doctoral study in librarianship has typically been oriented toward affording credentials for those who would then asume administrative roles in our institutions of greatest prestige—academia. Very few who have gone the doctoral route in librarianship have done it because of a commitment to a career in library education and scholarship. One cause, or effect, has been the heavy orientation to mastery of facts and details, the concentration upon learning more material like that required of a master's student, the short shrift given to, or the complete absence of attention to research methodology. As a consequence, librarianship simply does not now have the corps of scholars to carry out the research necessary, or, for that matter, to offer instruction at the level of sophistication necessary to advance the field and its insights. Moreover, if one shares the view that the clearest route to enriching the classroom is via study and analysis and research, then we have shortchanged our students in their programs of professional education. This is because typically those who instruct have not been scholars actively engaged in research in the subject matter in which they instruct, and they have therefore had less of a contribution to make than if they were engaged in ways common to virtually every other scholarly field nurtured by the university.

Let me say something about the rationale for our projected doctoral sequence. Until as late as even the 1950's librarianship might have been characterized as more art than science. Such research as the fields fostered lay in the historic and bibliographic areas. Its practice centered upon pragmatic operating problems. There was virtually no financial support for research and perhaps, as a consequence, the limited applied research which was pursued, concentrated upon the solution of immediate practical problems. Library education, which might have contributed scholarly orientation, was peopled by faculty members drawn predominantly from practice who were transplanted, with their pragmatic faith undisturbed by the need for conceptual, theoretical, or research guideposts. But with the increased demand for improved information organizations and technologies shaped by the decision-making and the research requirements of the last decade, with the increased recognition accorded the problems of scientific information access as a vital national concern, and with the rapid advances in the sophistication of computers dealing with problems of storage and retrieval, library

scholarship needs now to enter upon a period of dramatic metamorphosis.

Librarianship is itself now a field characterized by flux and faced with the pressing need for innovation, experimentation, adaptation in its organizational arrangements as well as its technology. New information disciplines are emerging, interdisciplinary links are being secured, and the research potential of the field looms as the most dramatic element in redirecting and focusing the future of the field. Librarianship's further advances, in particular its most fundamental advances, no longer await financial support. For, from a growing variety of sources, including most prominently the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the National Library of Medicine, and the Council on Library Resources, this is far more readily available. The fundamental requirement is an increase in the number of trained scholars prepared and dedicated to undertake requisite research. Librarianship has simply not generated a sufficient reservoir of researchers to keep pace with the increasing scale and complexity of the field's fundamental problems.

Eleven doctoral programs are now in existence in library schools, yet they are still primarily oriented toward the historic and bibliographic dimensions of the field. Their products have more often than not viewed their doctoral study as terminal, rather than as prelude to a life of scholarship and research, more as a vehicle for attainment of administrative office in libraries of academia and research establishments, and less as methodological introduction. The situation is now beginning to change somewhat. Several schools are adding the newer information sciences to their curricula. Programs outside the formal framework are emerging as well. But the hour is late and the field's needs for soundly prepared doctorates equipped with sophisticated methodological skills in research is very great.

The Maryland program will concern itself with the strategic area of information storage and retrieval, but a strong component will be the social and behavioral aspects of the field as well. Only in the 1930's and 1940's at the University of Chicago were the social science dimensions of the field given major attention in library education. Yet, while moving toward the improvement of information access through the use of technology, the social and human aspects need equally to be developed. This direction will constitute a major strength and particular emphasis at the University of Maryland, and since nowhere in graduate study in this field does this area constitute a primary field of concentration, it is expected that those interested in pursuing scholarship in this area may naturally elect Maryland for their advanced study.

Our design calls for a radical departure from traditional programs. All too often universities pioneer only in safe territory. The best defense for innovation in an American university, according to Harold Emerson, President of Cleveland State University,[2] is that it is being done elsewhere, somewhere in the great universities

[2] *Bulletin of International Education,* November 17, 1967, p. 3.

in whose model we fashion ourselves. The result is that we struggle to adopt as our model the fashions that are already being discarded.

We think this cannot be said of the program we hope to begin in fall 1969. For while this prospectus represents a new departure for library education to the doctorate, it is one which we believe to be a rational application and utilization of our scholarly capabilities. While its form may represent variation from the normal pattern of library doctoral programs, what we are proposing is not at all different from the traditional sequence followed in many other academic disciplines. Its substance is solidly founded in the confidence and commitments of those under whose care the program will be committed. For, the university itself provides the model for the doctoral sequence even if the library profession in its doctoral offering has not heretofore followed this precise route.

The faculty at Maryland feels strongly that the Ph.D. must be regarded in every respect in the traditional sense as a research degree. Its benefit to librarianship would be ill-served by shifting its emphasis to accommodate those who seek such study in order subsequently to pursue careers in administration. It will concentrate therefore upon the preparation of those selected to pursue the doctoral program in order to subsequently assume roles of scholarship and research in library education. Those applicants with other objectives will be encouraged to pursue their programs elsewhere; or, if they are insistent, they will be made to understand that while research preparation may serve as suitable intellectual indoctrination for an administrative career, only through such study, rather than pragmatic professional study, will library scholars and researchers be appropriately groomed.

Rigorous pursuit of this objective will require the school to distinguish those elements of its existing program which are primarily pragmatic in approach and exclude them from inclusion in the doctoral sequence. The fullest realization of this purpose will require considerable flexibility in the utilization of the university's resources to strengthen the background and thus develop the full potential of each candidate in his chosen career. The primary point of departure in this program calls for selection of doctoral students without reference to whether or not they have ever been to library school or worked in a library. They shall be able to begin doctoral study directly from a bachelor's program, or out of library education, if they have been through library education. Only those elements of our range of professional offerings which are viewed to be conceptual and theoretical will have a place in preparation for the doctorate.

Two basic routes to the doctorate have been identified. There is to be a common core of courses which will be required of all doctoral students, regardless of whether they choose the information storage and retrieval route, or the behavioral organization route. The people who pursue the degree with us will demonstrate an understanding of basic theory in the following areas: theoretical approaches to the organization of knowledge, documentation or the organization of recorded information and its handling, theory and structure of information systems, libraries in a social communications context, including information need and use, libraries in a context of organization and administrative theory. Rather

than specify program elements in detail, perhaps it will suffice to suggest that the nature of a student's research interests will influence what course sequence and which interdisciplinary route he will pursue. In information retrieval, beyond the seminars in the library school program, there would normally be work in the computer science center, work in mathematics and philosophy. Those centered in political and social elements of librarianship would be encouraged to carry courses in sociology, business administration, government and politics, and psychology. Such specialized areas as sociology of occupations and professions, theory of organization, public administration, or urban planning, might well be studied in depth.

Because we feel that ultimate solution to the problems of librarianship may well stem from contributions drawn from other disciplines reinforcing of our understanding, we hope that our doctoral program will prepare scholars for teaching and research in librarianship who will have better methodological equipment than the present generation of library educators. But, in the meantime, work proceeds. In our more ambitious research undertakings (notably in the manpower area), we have evolved a design in which we bring together a group of behavioral scholars to view one central problem from the vantage point of their discrete disciplines. Time precludes discussion of this project, but the program is amply documented in the literature.[3]

Yet, of all the problems of librarianship, germane to its direction and to its ultimate destiny, the most crucial may very well be those of motivation, commitment, passion, zeal, and concern. I have spoken of this issue elsewhere.[4] This pervasive problem, as much in evidence in library education as in practice, is reflected in the view that what's done is not important, or that there's so little that can be achieved, why bother. For, it's only a job, and if you don't do this, you do that, and does it really matter very much at all? In a period when opportunities in librarianship are infinitely abundant, too many librarians are drop-outs or under-achievers. Genuine commitment may be the rarest characteristic of all. Too few in librarianship basically or fundamentally care, either in practice or in education. We desperately need more who do. We need them in practice and, if we are to move further, faster, we need them in library education.

From my remarks you will by now have concluded how deeply I believe that librarianship's tomorrow is conditioned by library education and scholarship today. This is why I have committed my energies to the task of working toward adaptations in our educational practice and in our philosophy. Perhaps the essential element of such a philosophy is a view of education as an active agent engaged upon the process of engineering change in librarianship. For, if the true nature of the university is to question, to criticize, to analyze, and to perennially

---

[3]See "Manpower Blueprint" (with Bundy), *Library Journal,* Jan 15, 1967; and "The University of Maryland Manpower Research Project: A Stocktaking and Restatement" (with Bundy), *Library Journal,* April 1, 1968.

[4]"Professionalism Reconsidered" (with Bundy), *College and Research Libraries,* January 1968.

hold up for inspection established conventions, the intent must always be to seek to adapt, to modify, to further, to innovate, not in a negative sense so as simply to confuse or to demolish, but in order to progress. This perspective enforces an academic orientation naturally linked to the laboratory, both the real and the simulated types, with faculty committed to probing of theoretical and conceptual issues alongside the professional and the technical. In such a climate, it is constantly necessary to ask, not only of faculty and of student body, but of the field as well, "Why?"

Graduate study in the universities, and we must not forget that this is the level at which we function, must strive for nothing short of excellence, and it must ask this of all who are identified with it. If this be so, then we can be satisfied with nothing less than to establish librarianship at a level of intellectual parity with every other discipline. Yet, we in librarianship must be impelled by a sense of urgency, for this field in every setting in which it is practiced appears to be at the most critical juncture in its history. For we view as the imperative of library education and of library educators, the fashioning of new alternatives to enhance the professionalization of the field, for here is where we see most clearly the need, the challenge, the opportunity, and the promise.